



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

2 NAVY ANNEX

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20370-5100

TJR

Docket No: 3421-00

9 November 2000

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 7 November 2000. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found you enlisted in the Marine Corps on 27 December 1973 at the age of 19.

Your record reflects that on 30 October 1974 you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for two periods of unauthorized absence (UA) totalling 59 days. The punishment imposed was a \$250 forfeiture of pay and restriction for 60 days. Shortly thereafter, on 12 November 1974 you began a 483 day period of UA that was not terminated until 9 March 1976. On 18 March 1976 you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the forgoing period of UA. Your record also reflects that prior to submitting this request for discharge, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. On 23 March 1976 you received NJP for absence from your appointed place of duty and were awarded a \$80 forfeiture of pay.

Subsequently, your request was granted and your commanding officer was directed to issue you an other than honorable discharge by reason of the good of the service. As a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor. On 4 May 1976 you were so discharged.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully considered all mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity. The Board further considered your contentions that you were told that you would receive a general discharge, you should have received a hardship discharge, your discharge was based on incorrect information regarding automobile theft, and your ability to serve was impaired by personal, family, and medical problems, and a deprived background. However, the Board found the evidence and materials submitted were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given your frequent and lengthy periods of UA and your request for discharge to avoid trial for the same. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for an undesirable discharge was approved since, by this action, you escaped the possibility of confinement at hard labor and a punitive discharge. The Board also noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to support your contentions. Further, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Marine Corps when your request for a clemency discharge was granted and should not be permitted to change your discharge now. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER  
Executive Director